

Remarks

Status of the Subject Application

All pending claims—claims 1, 4-5, and 23-61—were rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by United States Patent 6,314,415 to Mukherjee (hereinafter “Mukherjee”).

In the Claims

Claims 1, 32, 36, 40, 41, 53, 57, and 61 have been amended herein to clarify their subject matter. Claims 62-70 have been added. Applicants respectfully note that in the previous Response dated February 22, 2005, typographical errors were made in transcribing some claims that were not being amended. Those claims (or portions thereof) have been transcribed herein in their correct form as written in the Response dated June 7, 2004.

Applicants submit that the amendments of claims 1 and 41 and the new claims 62-70 are supported in the Subject Application, for example, at page 14, lines 17-27, page 16, lines 17 to page 17, line 2 and in Figure 2, at page 22, lines 17-19, and generally throughout the application.

Applications submit that the amendments to claims 32 and 53 are supported in the Subject Application, for example, at page 15, lines 24-27, in Figure 2, and generally throughout the application.

Applications submit that the amendments to claims 36, 40, 57, and 61 are supported in the Subject Application, for example, at page 25, lines 13-18, page 34, lines 6-10 and 24-27, page 35, lines 1-3, in Figure 19, and generally throughout the application.

Rejection Under §102(e)

The Cited Art

Mukherjee states that it “relates generally to systems that produce computer-generated forms, such as standardized documents that must be filed with government agencies, legal documents, employment-related documents, and the like.” See column 1, lines 9-12.

Mukherjee states in its Summary of the Invention that it discloses a system that provides “features that facilitate data entry, avoid redundant and unnecessary information from graphical user interfaces, and permit changes to the user interfaces (and resulting forms) without relying on ‘hardcoded’ software.” See column 2, lines 20-24. The system, in various embodiments, “includes a rule-based expert system and method that uses high-level rules for determining what graphical interface features should be displayed to a user at a particular point in the process.” See column 2, lines 24-28. Certain embodiments include a scanner and related software that capture data fields from existing paper forms. See column 2, lines 39-41.

The Rejected Claims

Claims 1, 4-5, and 23-31

Claim 1 has been amended to recite a method for dynamically generating a user interface, including “*receiving a request to control at least one of a camera and a camera enabled device, selecting and retrieving, in response to the request, at least one dynamic rule from a plurality of rules stored in one or more databases. . .*” (emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that Mukherjee neither discloses nor suggests a system or method that includes a request to control a camera or a camera enabled device and processing that request. For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 1 is patentable over Mukherjee because Mukherjee does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 1.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 4-5 and 23-31 are also patentable because they depend from patentable claim 1.

Claims 32-35

Independent claim 32 has been amended to recite a method for dynamically generating a user interface, the method including one or more variable parameters, “each variable parameter representing information

pertaining to a function of the user interface, *the function comprising access to a medical device. . .*" (emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that Mukherjee neither discloses nor suggests a system or method that includes a user interface function to access a medical device. For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 32 is patentable over Mukherjee because Mukherjee does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 32.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 33-35 are also patentable because they depend from patentable claim 32.

Claims 36-40

Independent claim 36 has been amended to recite a method for defining a routine for generating a user interface, comprising defining a sequence presentation that includes "a medical image and at least one field to receive input associated with the medical image." A sequence presentation may be a presentation that allows multiple displays to be simultaneously displayed. See page 25, lines 13-18.

Applicants respectfully submit that Mukherjee neither discloses nor suggests a system or method including a sequence presentation that includes a medical image and an associated input field. For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 36 is patentable over Mukherjee because Mukherjee does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 36.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 37-40 are also patentable because they depend from patentable claim 36. Applicants note that claim 40 was amended merely to ensure antecedent basis in its terms.

Claims 41-52

Independent claim 41 has been amended to recite a system for dynamically generating a user interface, comprising "a server *to receive a request to control at least one of a camera and a camera enabled device and for selecting and retrieving, in response to the request, at least one dynamic rule*

from the plurality of rules. . .” (emphasis added). For at least the reason discussed above with respect to claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 41 is patentable over Mukherjee because Mukherjee does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 41.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 42-52 are also patentable because they depend from patentable claim 41.

Claims 53-56

Independent claim 53 has been amended to recite a system for dynamically generating a user interface, comprising one or more variable parameters, “each variable parameter representing information pertaining to a function of the user interface, *the functionality comprising access to a medical device. . .*” (emphasis added). For at least the reason discussed above with respect to claim 32, Applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 53 is patentable over Mukherjee because Mukherjee does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 53.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 54-56 are also patentable because they depend from patentable claim 53.

Claims 57-61

Independent claim 57 has been amended to recite a system for defining a routine for generating a user interface, comprising a server for defining a sequence presentation that includes “a medical image and at least one field to receive input associated with the medical image.” For at least the reason discussed above with respect to claim 36, Applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 57 is patentable over Mukherjee because Mukherjee does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 57.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 58-61 are also patentable because they depend from patentable claim 57. Applicants note that claim 61 was amended merely to ensure antecedent basis in its terms.

New Claims 62-70

New claims 62-65 depend from claim 1, and new claims 66-69 depend from claim 41. Because claims 1 and 41 are patentable as discussed above, new claims 62-69 are also patentable.

Claim 70 recites a method that dynamically generates a user interface by, in part, "receiving a request to control at least one of a camera and a camera enabled device." Applicants respectfully submit that Mukherjee neither discloses nor suggests a method that includes receiving a request to control at least one of a camera and a camera enabled device. For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 70 is patentable over Mukherjee because Mukherjee does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 70.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 4-5, and 23-70 are in condition for allowance. Applicants also submit that no new matter has been introduced in the claims presented herein. Accordingly, passage to allowance of claims 1, 4-5, and 23-70 at an early date is earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner is of the opinion that the Subject Application is in condition for disposition other than allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Applicants' Attorney at the telephone number listed below so that any concerns may be expeditiously addressed.

Respectfully Submitted



Richard W. James
Registration No. 43,690
Attorney for Applicants

25 Churchill Road
Pittsburgh, PA 15235
Phone: (412) 243-8708
Fax: (412) 243-4070
rich@jamespatent.com